arXiv:1703.01152v1 [math.MG] 3 Mar 2017

Equivalence of Lattice Orbit Polytopes

FRIEDER LADISCH AND ACHILL SCHÜRMANN

Dedicated to Jörg M. Wills on the occasion of his 80th birthday

ABSTRACT. Let G be a finite permutation group acting on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by permuting coordinates. A *core point* (for G) is an integral vector $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that the convex hull of the orbit Gz contains no other integral vectors but those in the orbit Gz. Herr, Rehn and Schürmann considered the question for which groups there are infinitely many core points up to *translation equivalence*, that is, up to translation by vectors fixed by the group. In the present paper, we propose a coarser equivalence relation for core points called *normalizer equivalence*. These equivalence classes often contain infinitely many vectors up to translation, for example when the group admits an irrational invariant subspace or an invariant irreducible subspace occurring with multiplicity greater than 1. We also show that the number of core points up to normalizer equivalence is finite if G is a so-called *QI-group*. These groups include all transitive permutation groups of prime degree. We apply the concept of normalizer equivalence to simplify integer linear optimization problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}(d, \mathbb{Z})$ be a finite group. We consider orbit polytopes $\mathrm{conv}(Gz)$ of integral vectors $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, that is, the convex hull of an orbit of a point z with integer coordinates. We call z a *core point* for G, when the vertices are the only integral vectors in the orbit polytope $\mathrm{conv}(Gz)$. Core points are relevant for symmetric convex integer optimization because any G-symmetric convex set contains an integer vector if and only if it contains a core point [9].

In the following, we write

$$\mathrm{Fix}(G) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid gv = v \text{ for all } g \in G\}$$

for the fixed space of G in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Notice that when z is a core point and $t \in \mathrm{Fix}(G) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$, then $z + t$ is another core point. We call the core points z and $z + t$ *translation equivalent*. Herr, Rehn and Schürmann [10] consider the question whether there

Date: March 2, 2017.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20C10; Secondary 16U60, 20B25, 20C15, 52B20, 90C10.

Key words and phrases. Orbit polytope, core points, group representation, lattice, integer linear programming.

The authors were supported by the DFG (Project: SCHU 1503/6-1).

are finitely or infinitely many core points up to translation equivalence, in the case where G is a permutation group acting by permuting coordinates. Their methods can be used to show that there are only finitely many core points up to translation, when $\mathbb{R}^d/\operatorname{Fix}(G)$ has no G-invariant subspaces other than the trivial ones [20, Theorem 3.13]. It is conjectured that in all other cases, there are infinitely many core points up to translation. This has been proved in special cases, but is open in general.

In this paper, we consider a coarser equivalence relation, where we allow to multiply core points with invertible integer matrices $S \in \mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})$ which centralize (or normalize) the subgroup G. Thus two points z and w are called *centralizer equivalent*, when $w = Sz + t$, where $S \in \mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})$ is such that $Sg = gS$ for all $g \in G$, and $t \in \operatorname{Fix}(G) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$. These coarser equivalence classes often contain infinitely many core points up to translation equivalence. For example, if $\mathbb{R}^d$ has an *irrational* invariant subspace $U \leqslant \mathbb{R}^d$ (that is, a subspace $\{0\} \neq U \leqslant \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $U \cap \mathbb{Z}^d = \{0\}$), then each integer point z with nonzero projection onto U is centralizer equivalent to infinitely many points, which are not translation equivalent. This yields another proof of the result of Herr, Rehn and Schürmann [10, Theorem 32] that there are infinitely many core points up to translation, when there is an irrational invariant subspace.

We also prove the following: Suppose that $G \leqslant \mathrm{S}_d$ is a transitive permutation group acting on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by permuting coordinates. Suppose that $\operatorname{Fix}(G)^\perp$ contains no rational G-invariant subspace other than $\{0\}$ and $\operatorname{Fix}(G)^\perp$ itself. (A subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$ is rational, if it has a basis contained in $\mathbb{Q}^d$.) Such a group G is called a *QI-group*. Then there are only finitely many core points up to centralizer equivalence.

For example, this is the case, when $d = p$ is a prime number (and $G \leqslant \mathrm{S}_p$ is transitive). In the case that the group is not 2-homogeneous, there are infinitely many core points up to translation, but these can be obtained from finitely many by multiplying with invertible integer matrices from the centralizer.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce different equivalence relations for core points and make some elementary observations. Section 3 collects some elementary properties of orders in semisimple algebras. In Section 4, we determine when the normalizer equivalence classes contain infinitely many points up to translation equivalence. In Section 5, we prove the aforementioned result on QI-groups. Sections 4 and 5 can mostly be read independently from another. In the final Section 6 we show how our theory can be applied to integer linear optimization problems with suitable symmetries.

2. Equivalence for core points

Let V be a finite-dimensional vector space over the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$ and G a finite group acting linearly on V.

2.1. **Definition.** An *orbit polytope* (for G) is the convex hull of the G-orbit of a point $v \in V$. It is denoted by

$$\mathrm{P}(G, v) = \mathrm{conv}\{gv \mid g \in G\}.$$

Let $\Lambda \subseteq V$ be a full $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice in V, that is, the $\mathbb{Z}$-span of an $\mathbb{R}$-basis of V. Assume that G maps Λ onto itself.

2.2. **Definition.** [9] An element $z \in \Lambda$ is called a *core point* (for G and Λ) if the only lattice points in $\mathrm{P}(G, z)$ are its vertices, that is, the elements in the orbit Gz. In other words, z is a core point if

$$\mathrm{P}(G, z) \cap \Lambda = Gz.$$

2.3. **Remark.** The barycenter

$$\frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} gv \in \mathrm{P}(G, v)$$

is always fixed by G. If $\mathrm{Fix}_V(G)$, the set of vectors in V fixed by all $g \in G$, consists only of 0, then the barycenter of each orbit polytope is the zero vector. In this case, only the zero vector is a core point.

More generally, the map

$$e_1 = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} g$$

gives the projection from V onto the fixed space $\mathrm{Fix}_V(G)$. The projection $e_1\Lambda$ is a full lattice in $\mathrm{Fix}_V(G)$ containing $\mathrm{Fix}_\Lambda(G) = \mathrm{Fix}_V(G) \cap \Lambda$. So when $\mathrm{Fix}_\Lambda(G) = e_1\Lambda$, then the only core points are the fixed points of G in Λ.

On the other hand, it is not difficult to see that for each $v \in e_1\Lambda$, there are core points z with $e_1 z = v$. Namely, among all $z \in \Lambda$ with $e_1 z = v$, there are elements with minimal squared norm $\|z\|^2$, and these are core points.

If z is a core point and $b \in \mathrm{Fix}_\Lambda(G)$, then $z + b$ is a core point, too, because $\mathrm{P}(G, z + b) = \mathrm{P}(G, z) + b$. Such core points should be considered as *equivalent*. This viewpoint was adopted by Herr, Rehn and Schürmann [9, 10]. In the present paper, we consider a coarser equivalence relation. We write $\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)$ for the invertible $\mathbb{Z}$-linear maps $\Lambda \to \Lambda$. Since Λ contains a basis of V, we may view $\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)$ as a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(V)$. (If $V = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^d$, then we can identify $\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)$ with $\mathrm{GL}(d, \mathbb{Z})$, the set of matrices over $\mathbb{Z}$ with determinant ± 1.)

By assumption, G is a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)$. We use the following notation from group theory: The *normalizer* of G in $\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)$ is the set

$$\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G) := \{S \in \mathrm{GL}(\Lambda) \mid \forall g \in G\colon S^{-1}gS \in G\}.$$

The *centralizer* of G in $\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)$ is the set

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G) := \{S \in \mathrm{GL}(\Lambda) \mid \forall g \in G\colon S^{-1}gS = g\}.$$

2.4. **Definition.** Two points z and w are called *normalizer equivalent*, if there is a point $b \in \mathrm{Fix}_\Lambda(G)$ and an element S in the normalizer $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ of G in $\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)$ such that $w = Sz+b$. The points are called *centralizer equivalent* if $w = Sz+b$ with $S \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ and $b \in \mathrm{Fix}_\Lambda(G)$. Finally, we call two points z and w *translation equivalent*, when $w - z \in \mathrm{Fix}_\Lambda(G)$.

This is justified by the following simple observation:

2.5. **Lemma.** *If*

$$w = Sz + b \quad \textit{with} \quad S \in \mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G) \quad \textit{and} \quad b \in \mathrm{Fix}_\Lambda(G),$$

then $x \mapsto Sx + b$ defines a bijection between

$$\mathrm{P}(G, z) \cap \Lambda \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{P}(G, w) \cap \Lambda.$$

In particular, z is a core point if and only if w is a core point.

Proof. The affine bijection $x \mapsto Sx + b$ maps the orbit polytope $\mathrm{P}(G, z)$ to another polytope. The vertex gz is mapped to the vertex

$$Sgz + b = (SgS^{-1})Sz + b = hSz + b = h(Sz + b) = hw,$$

where $h = SgS^{-1} \in G$ (since S normalizes G). The second last equality follows as b is fixed by G. As SgS^{-1} runs through G as g does, it follows that $x \mapsto Sx + b$ maps the orbit Gz to the orbit Gw and thus maps the orbit polytope $\mathrm{P}(G, z)$ to the orbit polytope $\mathrm{P}(G, w)$. Since $x \mapsto Sx + b$ also maps Λ onto itself, the result follows. □

Herr, Rehn and Schürmann [10, 8, 20] considered the question whether the set of core points up to translation is finite or infinite (in the case where G acts by permuting coordinates). We might ask the same question about core points up to normalizer equivalence as defined here. Also, it is of interest whether our bigger equivalence classes contain finitely or infinitely many points up to translation.

2.6. **Remark.** Notice that $\mathrm{Fix}_\Lambda(G)$ consists exactly of the points equivalent to 0, for all equivalences defined here. These are the *trivial core points*.

If z is any non-trivial core point, then we must have $e_1 z \notin \Lambda$, where $e_1 = (1/|G|)\sum g$ is the projection onto the fixed space. Suppose that $z \in V$ is such that the orbit Gz linearly spans V. Then $\mathrm{Fix}_V(G)$ has dimension at most 1. The elements of $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ map $\mathrm{Fix}_\Lambda(G)$ onto itself, and thus act on $\mathrm{Fix}_V(G)$ as ± 1. Thus

$$\Big(\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)z\Big) \cap \Big(z + \mathrm{Fix}_V(G)\Big) \subseteq \{z, z - 2z|_{\mathrm{Fix}_V(G)}\}.$$

This means that different elements in $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)z$ are almost never translation equivalent. In particular, if $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is infinite, then the normalizer equivalence class of a nontrivial core point z contains infinitely many translation equivalence classes.

It is sometimes easier to work with the centralizer $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ instead of the normalizer $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$, which yields a slightly finer equivalence relation. By the following simple observation, the $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$-equivalence classes can not be much smaller than the $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$-equivalence classes:

2.7. **Lemma.** $|\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G) : \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)|$ *is finite.*

Proof. The factor group $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)/\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ [12, Corollary X.19], and $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ is finite, since G itself is finite by assumption. □

3. Preliminaries on orders

In this section, we collect some simple properties of *orders* in semi-simple algebras over $\mathbb{Q}$. Orders are relevant for us since the centralizer $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ can be identified with the *unit group* of such an order, as we explain below.

Recall the following definition [21]: Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$ (associative, with one). An *order* (or $\mathbb{Z}$-*order*) in A is a subring $R \subset A$ which is finitely generated as $\mathbb{Z}$-module and such that $\mathbb{Q}R = A$. (Here, "subring" means in particular that R and A have the same multiplicative identity.) In other words, an order is a full $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice in A which is at the same time a subring of A.

As in the first section, let Λ be a lattice on which the finite group G acts. For the moment, let us change notation and write $V = \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \Lambda$. Let $A := \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Q}G}(V)$ be the ring of $\mathbb{Q}G$-module endomorphisms of V, that is, the set of linear maps $\alpha\colon V \to V$ such that $\alpha(gv) = g\alpha(v)$ for all $v \in V$ and $g \in G$. This is just the centralizer of G in the ring of all $\mathbb{Q}$-linear endomorphisms of V.

We claim that

$$R := \{\alpha \in A \mid \alpha(\Lambda) \subseteq \Lambda\}$$

is an order in A. Namely, choose a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of Λ. This basis is also a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of V. By identifying linear maps with matrices with respect to the chosen basis, A gets identified with the centralizer of G in the set of *all* $d \times d$ matrices over $\mathbb{Q}$, and R gets identified with the centralizer of G in the set of $d \times d$ matrices with entries in $\mathbb{Z}$. It follows that R is finitely generated as $\mathbb{Z}$-module, and for every $\alpha \in A$ there is an $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $m\alpha \in R$. Thus R is an order of A. (Also, $R \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}G}(\Lambda)$ naturally.)

Moreover, the centralizer $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is exactly the set of invertible elements of R, that is, the unit group $\mathbf{U}(R)$ of R. For this reason, it is somewhat easier to work with $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ instead of the normalizer $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$. The unit group $\mathbf{U}(R)$ of an order R is a finitely generated (even finitely presented) group [13, § 3]. Finding explicit generators of $\mathbf{U}(R)$ (and relations between them) is in general a difficult task, but there do exist algorithms for this purpose [2]. The situation is somewhat better when R is abelian, for example when $R \cong \mathbb{Z}A$, where A is a finite abelian

group [6]. Moreover, it is quite easy to give generators of a subgroup of $\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{Z}A)$ which has finite index in $\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{Z}A)$ [11, 16].

We now collect some general elementary facts about orders that we need. (For a comprehensive treatment of orders, not only over $\mathbb{Z}$, we refer the reader to Reiner's book on maximal orders [21]. For unit groups of orders, see the survey article by Kleinert [13].)

3.1. **Lemma.** *Let R_1 and R_2 be two orders in the $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra A. Then $R_1 \cap R_2$ is also an order in A.*

Proof. Clearly, $R_1 \cap R_2$ is a subring.

Since R_2 is finitely generated over $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Q}R_1 = A$, there is a non-zero integer $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $mR_2 \subseteq R_1$. Thus $mR_2 \subseteq R_1 \cap R_2$. Since mR_2 contains a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of A, it follows that $R_1 \cap R_2$ contains such a basis. As a submodule of a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-module, $R_1 \cap R_2$ is again finitely generated. Thus $R_1 \cap R_2$ is an order of A. □

3.2. **Lemma.** *Let R_1 and R_2 be orders in the $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra A with $R_1 \subseteq R_2$. Then $|\mathbf{U}(R_2) : \mathbf{U}(R_1)|$ is finite.*

Proof. There exists a non-zero integer m such that $mR_2 \subseteq R_1$. Suppose that u, $v \in \mathbf{U}(R_2)$ are such that $u - v \in mR_2$. Then $u \in v + mR_2$ and thus $uv^{-1} \in 1 + mR_2 \subseteq R_1$. Similarly, $vu^{-1} \in 1 + mR_2 \subseteq R_1$. Thus $uv^{-1} \in \mathbf{U}(R_1)$. This shows $|\mathbf{U}(R_2) : \mathbf{U}(R_1)| \leqslant |R_2 : mR_2| < \infty$, as claimed. □

3.3. **Corollary.** *Let R_1 and R_2 be two orders in the $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra A. Then $\mathbf{U}(R_1)$ is finite if and only if $\mathbf{U}(R_2)$ is finite.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, $R_1 \cap R_2$ is an order. By Lemma 3.2, the index $|\mathbf{U}(R_i) : \mathbf{U}(R_1 \cap R_2)|$ is finite for $i = 1, 2$. The result follows. □

4. Finiteness of equivalence classes

In this section we determine for which groups G the normalizer equivalence classes are finite or not, and in particular, when the normalizer $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is finite or not.

We use the notation introduced in Section 2. So let V be a $\mathbb{R}G$-module and $\Lambda \subset V$ a full $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice which is stabilized by G. A subspace $U \leqslant V$ is called Λ-*rational* if $U \cap \Lambda$ contains a basis of U, and Λ-*irrational*, if $U \cap \Lambda = \{0\}$. If U is an irreducible $\mathbb{R}G$-submodule, then U is either Λ-rational or Λ-irrational.

4.1. **Theorem.** *Let*

$$V = U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_r$$

be a decomposition of V into irreducible $\mathbb{R}G$-subspaces. Then $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ has finite order if and only if all the U_i's are Λ-rational and pairwise non-isomorphic.

Before proving this, let us mention the following:

4.2. **Remark.** Let $z \in V$ be an element such that the orbit Gz linearly spans V. Then the orbit $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)z$ has finite size if and only if $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ has finite size.

Proof. Clearly, when $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ has finite size, then every orbit of that group is finite.

Now assume that $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ has infinite order. By Lemma 2.7, the centralizer $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ has also infinite order. If $cz = z$ for $c \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$, then $cgz = gcz = gz$ for all $g \in G$ and thus $c = 1$. Thus

$$\infty = |\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)| = |\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)z| \leqslant |\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)z|.$$

□

It follows from the theorem that when V has an irrational invariant subspace, then $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is infinite. Thus if z is a core point, then there are infinitely many core points, even up to translation. This was first proved by Thomas Rehn [20, 10].

Another consequence of Theorem 4.1 is that $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is infinite when V is not multiplicity-free (as $\mathbb{R}G$-module).

The proof of Theorem 4.1 involves some non-trivial representation and number theory. By Lemma 2.7, the normalizer $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is finite if and only if the centralizer $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is finite. As remarked earlier, the centralizer can naturally be identified with the set of units of the ring $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}G}(\Lambda)$, and $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}G}(\Lambda)$ is an order in the $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Q}G}(\mathbb{Q}\Lambda)$, where $\mathbb{Q}\Lambda \cong \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \Lambda$. For this reason, it is more convenient to work with the $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space $W := \mathbb{Q}\Lambda$.

Fix a decomposition of $W = \mathbb{Q}\Lambda$ into simple modules:

$$W \cong m_1 S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus m_r S_r, \quad m_i \in \mathbb{N},$$

where we assume that $S_i \ncong S_j$ for $i \neq j$. Set $D_i := \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Q}G}(S_i)$, which is by Schur's lemma [14, (3.6)] a division ring, and finite dimensional over $\mathbb{Q}$.

4.3. **Lemma.** *With the above notation, we have*

$$\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Q}G}(V) \cong \mathbf{M}_{m_1}(D_1) \times \cdots \times \mathbf{M}_{m_r}(D_r),$$

where $\mathbf{M}_m(D)$ denotes the ring of $m \times m$ matrices with entries in D. If R_i is an order in D_i for each i, then

$$R := \mathbf{M}_{m_1}(R_1) \times \cdots \times \mathbf{M}_{m_r}(R_r)$$

is an order in $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Q}G}(V)$.

Proof. The first assertion is a standard observation, used for example in one proof of the Wedderburn-Artin structure theorem for semisimple rings [14, Thm. 3.5 and proof]. The assertion on orders is then easy. □

In particular, the group of units of R is then isomorphic to the direct product of groups of the form $\mathrm{GL}(m_i, R_i)$. To prove Theorem 4.1, in view of Corollary 3.3, it

suffices to determine when all these groups are finite. The following is a first step towards the proof of the theorem:

4.4. **Corollary.** *If some $m_i > 1$, then $\mathbf{U}(R)$ (and thus $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$) is infinite.*

Proof. $\mathbf{U}(R)$ contains a subgroup isomorphic to $\mathrm{GL}(m_i, R_i)$, which contains the group $\mathrm{GL}(m_i, \mathbb{Z})$. This group is infinite if $m_i > 1$. □

To continue with the proof of Theorem 4.1, we have to look at the units of an order R_i in D_i. We use the following theorem of Käte Hey which can be seen as a generalization of Dirichlet's unit theorem:

4.5. **Theorem.** *[13, Theorem 1] Let D be a finite dimensional division algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$, and let R be an order of D with unit group $\mathbf{U}(R)$. Set*

$$S = \{d \in D \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \mid (\det d)^2 = 1\}.$$

Then $S/\mathbf{U}(R)$ is compact. (Here $\det d$ refers to the action of d as linear operator on $D \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$. One can also use the reduced norm, of course.)

From this, we can derive the following result (probably well known):

4.6. **Lemma.** *Let D be a finite dimensional division algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$ and R an order of D. Then $|\mathbf{U}(R)| < \infty$ if and only if $D \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$ is a division ring.*

Proof. Suppose $D_{\mathbb{R}} := D \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$ is a division ring. By Frobenius' theorem, we have $D_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{H}$. In each case, one checks that the set S defined in Theorem 4.5 is compact. Thus the discrete group $\mathbf{U}(R) \subseteq S$ must be finite. (Notice that we did not use Theorem 4.5 here, only that $\mathbf{U}(R) \subseteq S$.)

Conversely, suppose that $D_{\mathbb{R}}$ is not a division ring. Then there is some non-trivial idempotent $e \in D_{\mathbb{R}}$, that is, $e^2 = e$, but $e \neq 0, 1$. (This follows since $D_{\mathbb{R}}$ is semisimple.) Set $f = 1 - e$. Then for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\det(\lambda e + \mu f) = \lambda^{k_1}\mu^{k_2}$ with $k_1 = \dim(D_{\mathbb{R}}e)$ and $k_2 = \dim(D_{\mathbb{R}}f)$. In particular, for every $\lambda \neq 0$ there is some μ such that $\lambda e + \mu f \in S$. This means that S is unbounded, and thus not compact. It follows from Theorem 4.5 that $\mathbf{U}(R)$ can not be finite. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. First, assume that we are given a decomposition $V = U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_r$ as in the theorem. Then $S_i := U_i \cap \mathbb{Q}\Lambda$ contains a basis of U_i and thus is non-zero, and necessarily simple as $\mathbb{Q}G$-module. Thus

$$W = V \cap \mathbb{Q}\Lambda = S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus S_r$$

is a decomposition of W into simple $\mathbb{Q}G$-modules, which are pairwise non-isomorphic. It follows that

$$\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Q}}(W) \cong D_1 \times \cdots \times D_r,$$

where $D_i = \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Q}G}(S_i)$. Since $D_i \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{R}G}(U_i)$ is a division ring, too, it follows that the orders of each D_i have a finite unit group, by Lemma 4.6. Thus $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is finite.

Conversely, assume that $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)$ is finite. It follows from Corollary 4.4 that W has a decomposition into simple summands which are pairwise non-isomorphic:

$$W = S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus S_r.$$

Let $D_i = \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{R}G}(S_i)$. Then Lemma 4.6 yields that $D_i \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$ is a division ring, too. Since $D_i \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{R}G}(S_i\mathbb{R})$, it follows that $U_i := S_i\mathbb{R}$ is simple. (Otherwise, the projection to a nontrivial invariant submodule would be a zero-divisor in $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{R}G}(U_i)$.) For $i \neq j$, we have $U_i \ncong U_j$ by the Noether-Deuring theorem [14, Theorem 19.25]. Thus V has a decomposition $V = U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_r$ as required. □

4.7. **Example.** Consider the regular representation of a group G, that is, G acts on $\mathbb{Q}G$ by left multiplication, so it permutes the canonical basis G. As lattice, we choose the group ring $\mathbb{Z}G$, the vectors with integer coordinates. Then $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}G}(\mathbb{Z}G) \cong \mathbb{Z}G$. Units of group rings are a much studied problem. A theorem of Higman says that $\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{Z}G)$ is finite if and only if G is abelian of exponent 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6, or $G \cong Q_8 \times E$ with $E^2 = \{1\}$. This is also easy to derive from Theorem 4.1.

For example, let the cyclic group C_4 of order 4 act on $\mathbb{R}^4$ by permuting coordinates. Then $\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{Z}C_4)$ is finite, and so the equivalence classes are finite (up to translation by fixed points). There are, however, infinitely many nonequivalent core points, as was shown by Herr, Rehn and Schürmann [10].

On the other hand, when p is a prime, then there are only finitely many core points up to equivalence in $\mathbb{Z}C_p$, by Theorem 5.1 below. If $p \geqslant 5$, then $\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{Z}C_p)$ is infinite.

5. Rationally irreducible

Suppose that $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^d$, and assume that G acts on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by matrices in $\mathrm{GL}(d, \mathbb{Z})$. A subspace $U \leqslant \mathbb{R}^d$ is called *irrational*, if $U \cap \mathbb{Q}^d = \{0\}$, and *rational*, if U has a basis contained in $\mathbb{Q}^d$. If U is an irreducible $\mathbb{R}G$-submodule, then U is either rational or irrational. In this section, we prove the following result:

5.1. **Theorem.** *Let $G \leqslant \mathrm{S}_d$ be a transitive permutation group acting on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by permuting coordinates, and such that $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$ does not contain any rational G-invariant subspace other than $\{0\}$ and $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$ itself. Then there are only finitely many core points up to equivalence. (That is, up to translation by fixed integer vectors and multiplication with elements of $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})}(G)$).*

Notice that $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$ contains no non-trivial rational invariant subspaces if and only if $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp \cap \mathbb{Q}^d$ contains no proper G-invariant subspace other than $\{0\}$. In algebraic language, this means that $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp \cap \mathbb{Q}^d$ is a simple module over $\mathbb{Q}G$. Following Dixon [5], who studied such groups, we call a permutation group G a *QI-group*, when $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$ contains no non-trivial rational subspaces, equivalently, when $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp \cap \mathbb{Q}^d$ is simple as $\mathbb{Q}G$-module.

We divide the proof of Theorem 5.1 into a number of lemmas. The idea is the following: We show that for any vector $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ there is some $c \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})}(G)$ such that the projections of cz to the different irreducible real subspaces of $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$ have approximately the same norm. (At the same time, this point cz is one with minimal norm in the orbit $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(\Lambda)}(G)z$.) When z is a core point, at least one of these norms must be "small", by a fundamental result of Herr, Rehn and Schürmann [10, Theorem 9] (Theorem 5.8 below).

The first lemma is taken from Dixon's paper [5, Lemma 6(b)]. Here $\mathrm{Irr}\, G$ is the set of irreducible characters of the group G (over the complex numbers), $\mathbb{Q}(\chi)$ is the field generated by the values of χ, which is a finite Galois extension of $\mathbb{Q}$, and $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\chi)/\mathbb{Q})$ is the corresponding Galois group.

5.2. **Lemma** (Dixon [5])**.** *Let G be a QI-group and let π be the permutation character of G. Let $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}\, G$ be an irreducible constituent of $\pi - 1$ (the character of G on $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$). Then*

$$\pi = 1 + \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \chi^\alpha, \quad \textit{where} \quad \Gamma = \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\chi)/\mathbb{Q}).$$

For the moment, we work with the complex space $\mathbb{C}^d$, on which G acts by permuting coordinates. Recall that to each $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}\, G$ corresponds a central primitive idempotent of the group algebra $\mathbb{C}G$, namely

$$e_\chi = \frac{\chi(1)}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \chi(g^{-1}) g \in \mathrm{Z}(\mathbb{C}G).$$

If V is any $\mathbb{C}G$-module, then $e_\chi V$ is the χ-homogeneous component of V, and the character of $e_\chi V$ is an integer multiple of χ [22, Section 2.6]. In the present situation, it follows from Lemma 5.2 that

$$U := e_\chi \mathbb{C}^d = \{v \in \mathbb{C}^d \mid e_\chi v = v\}$$

is itself an irreducible module affording the character χ. In particular, U has a basis contained in K^d, where $K := \mathbb{Q}(\chi)$.

Another consequence of Lemma 5.2 is that we have the decomposition

$$\mathbb{C}^d = \mathrm{Fix}(G) \oplus \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \Gamma} U^\gamma.$$

Here U^γ means this: Since U has a basis in $\mathbb{Q}(\chi)^d$, we can apply γ to the coordinates of the vectors in such a basis. The linear span of the result is denoted by U^γ. This is independent of the chosen basis.

5.3. **Lemma.** *Set $A := \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}_d(\mathbb{Q})}(G) \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Q}G}(\mathbb{Q}^d)$. There is an algebra homomorphism $\lambda\colon A \to \mathbb{Q}(\chi)$ such that each $a \in A$ acts on U^γ by multiplication with $\lambda(a)^\gamma$, and such that $\lambda(a^t) = \overline{\lambda(a)}$. There is another homomorphism $m\colon A \to \mathbb{Q}$, such that*

$$A \cong \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}(\chi) \quad \textit{via} \quad a \mapsto (m(a), \lambda(a)).$$

The isomorphism $A \cong \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}(\chi)$ appears in Dixon's paper [5, Lemma 6(d)], and follows from Lemma 5.2 together with general results in representation theory. But as we need the specific properties of the map λ from the lemma, we give a detailed proof:

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Suppose the matrix a centralizes G, and let $\lambda(a) \in \mathbb{C}$ be an eigenvalue of a on U. The corresponding eigenspace is G-invariant, since a centralizes G. Since U is irreducible, U is contained in the eigenspace of $\lambda(a)$.

When $a \in A \subseteq \mathbf{M}_d(\mathbb{Q})$, then a maps $U \cap \mathbb{Q}(\chi)^d \neq \{0\}$ to itself, and thus $\lambda(a) \in \mathbb{Q}(\chi)$. This defines the algebra homomorphism $\lambda\colon A \to \mathbb{Q}(\chi)$.

When $u \in U \cap \mathbb{Q}(\chi)^d$, $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $a \in A$, then $au^\gamma = (au)^\gamma = \lambda(a)^\gamma u^\gamma$. Thus a acts as $\lambda(a)^\gamma$ on U^γ.

Each $a \in A$ acts also on the one-dimensional fixed space by multiplication with some $m(a) \in \mathbb{Q}$. As

$$\mathbb{C}^d = \mathrm{Fix}(G) \oplus \bigoplus_{\gamma\in\Gamma} U^\gamma,$$

we see that the space $\mathbb{C}^d$ has a basis of common eigenvectors for all $a \in A$. With respect to this basis, each a is a diagonal matrix, where $m(a)$ appears once and $\lambda(a)^\gamma$ appears $\chi(1)$-times for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$. In particular, the map $A \ni a \mapsto (m(a), \lambda(a))$ is injective.

Since G acts orthogonally with respect to the standard inner product on $\mathbb{C}^d$, the above decomposition into irreducible subspaces is orthogonal and we can find an orthonormal basis of common eigenvectors of all $a \in A$. From this, it is clear that $\lambda(a^t) = \lambda(a^*) = \overline{\lambda(a)}$.

To see that $a \mapsto (m(a), \lambda(a))$ is onto, let $(q, \mu) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}(\chi)$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(q,\mu) &:= qe_1 + \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} (\mu e_\chi)^\gamma \\ &= q\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G} g + \frac{\chi(1)}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\left(\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\left(\mu\chi(g^{-1})\right)^\gamma\right) g \\ &\in \mathrm{Z}(\mathbb{Q}G).\end{aligned}$$

Then the corresponding map $v \mapsto \varphi(q,\mu)v$ is in A, and from $\varphi(q,\mu)e_1 = qe_1$ and $\varphi(q,\mu)e_\chi = \mu e_\chi$ we see that $m(\varphi(q,\mu)) = q$ and $\lambda(\varphi(q,\mu)) = \mu$. This finishes the proof that $A \cong \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}(\chi)$. □

5.4. **Lemma.** *Set $W := (U + \overline{U}) \cap \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d$ into irreducible $\mathbb{R}G$-modules is given by*

$$\mathbb{R}^d = \mathrm{Fix}(G) \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Gamma_0} W^\alpha, \quad \Gamma_0 = \mathrm{Gal}((\mathbb{Q}(\chi) \cap \mathbb{R})/\mathbb{Q}).$$

(In particular, W is irreducible as $\mathbb{R}G$-module.) For $w \in W^\alpha$ and $a \in A$, we have $\|aw\|^2 = \left(\overline{\lambda(a)}\lambda(a)\right)^\alpha \|w\|^2$.

Proof. When $\mathbb{Q}(\chi) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, then $\overline{U} = U$ and $W = U \cap \mathbb{R}^d$. The result is clear in this case.

Otherwise, we have $U \cap \mathbb{R}^d = \{0\}$ and $U \cap \overline{U} = \{0\}$, and so $W = (U \oplus \overline{U}) \cap \mathbb{R}^d \neq \{0\}$, and thus again W is simple over $\mathbb{R}G$.

The extension $\mathbb{Q}(\chi)/\mathbb{Q}$ has abelian Galois group, and thus $\mathbb{Q}(\chi) \cap \mathbb{R}$ is also Galois over $\mathbb{Q}$. The Galois group Γ_0 is isomorphic to the factor group $\Gamma/\{\mathrm{Id}, \kappa\}$, where κ denotes complex conjugation. Suppose $\alpha \in \Gamma_0$ is the restriction of $\gamma \in \Gamma$ to $\mathbb{Q}(\chi) \cap \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$W^\alpha = \left((U + \overline{U}) \cap \mathbb{R}^d\right)^\alpha = (U^\gamma + \overline{U}^\gamma) \cap \mathbb{R}^d = (U^\gamma + U^{\kappa\gamma}) \cap \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The statement about the decomposition follows.

The last statement is immediate from Lemma 5.3. □

5.5. **Lemma.** *Let $C := \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})}(G)$ and define*

$$L\colon C \to \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0}, \quad L(c) := \left(\log(\overline{\lambda(c)}\lambda(c))^\alpha\right)_{\alpha \in \Gamma_0}.$$

Then the image $L(C)$ of C under this map is a full lattice in the hyperplane

$$H = \{(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Gamma_0} \mid \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_0} x_\alpha = 0\}.$$

We will derive this lemma from the following version of Dirichlet's unit theorem [18, Satz I.7.3]:

5.6. **Lemma.** *Let K be a finite field extension over $\mathbb{Q}$, let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r\colon K \to \mathbb{R}$ be the different real field embeddings of K, and let $\beta_1, \overline{\beta_1}, \ldots, \beta_s, \overline{\beta_s}\colon K \to \mathbb{C}$ be the different complex embeddings of K, whose image is not contained in $\mathbb{R}$. Let O_K be the ring of algebraic integers in K and $l\colon K^* \to \mathbb{R}^{r+s}$ the map*

$$z \mapsto l(z) = (\log|z^{\alpha_1}|, \ldots, \log|z^{\alpha_r}|, \log|z^{\beta_1}|, \ldots, \log|z^{\beta_s}|) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+s}.$$

Then the image $l(\mathbf{U}(O_K))$ of the unit group of O_K under l is a full lattice in the hyperplane

$$H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{r+s} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{r+s} x_i = 0\}.$$

In the proof of Lemma 5.5, we will apply this result to $K = \mathbb{Q}(\chi)$. Set $F = K \cap \mathbb{R}$, $\Gamma_0 = \mathrm{Gal}(F/\mathbb{Q})$ and $\Gamma = \mathrm{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q})$. If $F = K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, then $r = |K : \mathbb{Q}|$ and $s = 0$. In this case, $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r\} = \Gamma = \Gamma_0$. If $K \not\subseteq \mathbb{R}$, then $|K : F| = 2$, $r = 0$ and $s = |F : \mathbb{Q}|$. In this case, we may identify the set $\{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s\}$ with the Galois group Γ_0: for each $\alpha \in \Gamma_0$, there are two extensions of α to the field K, and these are complex conjugate. Thus we get a set $\{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s\}$ as in Lemma 5.6 by choosing exactly one extension for each $\alpha \in \Gamma$. The map l is independent of this choice, anyway.

It follows that in both cases, we may rewrite the map l (somewhat imprecisely) as

$$l(z) = \left(\log|z^\alpha|\right)_{\alpha \in \Gamma_0}.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.5. First notice that the entries of $L(c)$ can be written as

$$\log\left(\overline{\lambda(c)}\lambda(c)\right)^{\alpha} = \log\left(\overline{\lambda(c)^{\alpha}}\lambda(c)^{\alpha}\right) = \log|\lambda(c)^{\alpha}|^2 \\ = 2\log|\lambda(c)^{\alpha}|,$$

where we tacitly replaced α by an extension to $\mathbb{Q}(\chi)$, when $\mathbb{Q}(\chi) \not\subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Thus $L(c) = 2l(\lambda(c))$ for all $c \in C$, with l as in Lemma 5.6.

In view of Lemma 5.6, it remains to show that the group $\lambda(C)$ has finite index in $\mathbf{U}(O_K)$. We know that C is the group of units in $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}_d(\mathbb{Z})}(G) \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}G}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, which is an order in $A \cong \mathbb{Q} \times K$. Another order in $\mathbb{Q} \times K$ (in fact, the unique maximal order) is $\mathbb{Z} \times O_K$ with unit group $\{\pm 1\} \times \mathbf{U}(O_K)$. By Lemma 3.2, it follows that C has finite index in $\{\pm 1\} \times \mathbf{U}(O_K)$. Thus $\lambda(C)$ has finite index in $\mathbf{U}(O_K)$ and the result follows. □

For each $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let v_α be the orthogonal projection of v onto the simple subspace W^α.

5.7. **Lemma.** *There is a constant D, depending only on the group G, such that for every $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $v_\alpha \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Gamma_0$, there is an $c \in C$ with*

$$\frac{\|(cv)_\alpha\|^2}{\|(cv)_\beta\|^2} \leqslant D$$

for all α, $\beta \in \Gamma_0$.

As $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp \cap \mathbb{Q}^d$ is a simple module, the assumption $v_\alpha \neq 0$ for all α holds in particular for all $v \in \mathbb{Q}^d \setminus \mathrm{Fix}(G)$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.5, there is a compact set T,

$$T \subset H = \{(x_\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0} \mid \sum_\alpha x_\alpha = 0\},$$

such that $H = T + L(C)$. (For example, we can choose T as a fundamental parallelepiped of the full lattice $L(C)$ in H.)

For $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as in the statement of the lemma, define

$$N(v) = \left(\log\|v_\alpha\|^2\right)_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0}.$$

Let $S \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0}$ be the vector having all entries equal to

$$s := \frac{1}{|\Gamma_0|}\sum_\alpha \log\|v_\alpha\|^2.$$

This s is chosen such that $N(v) - S \in H$. Thus there is $c \in C$ such that $L(c) + N(v) - S \in T$, say $L(c) + N(v) - S = t = (t_\alpha)$.

As

$$\|(cv)_\alpha\|^2 = \|cv_\alpha\|^2 = \left(\overline{\lambda(c)}\lambda(c)\right)^{\alpha}\|v_\alpha\|^2,$$

it follows that

$$N(cv) = L(c) + N(v)$$

in general. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\log\|cv_\alpha\|^2 - \log\|cv_\beta\|^2 &= (\log\|cv_\alpha\|^2 - s) - (\log\|cv_\beta\|^2 - s)\\ &= (N(cv) - S)_\alpha - (N(cv) - S)_\beta\\ &= t_\alpha - t_\beta\\ &\leqslant \max_{\alpha,t} t_\alpha - \min_{\beta,t} t_\beta =: D_0.\end{aligned}$$

This maximum and minimum exist since T is compact. The number D_0 may depend on the choice of the set T, but not on v or c. Thus $\|cv_\alpha\|^2/\|cv_\beta\|^2$ is bounded by $D := e^{D_0}$. □

We see from the proof that we get a bound whenever we have a subgroup C_0 of $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})}(G)$ such that $L(C_0)$ is a full lattice in the hyperplane H. Of course, we do not get the optimal bound then, but in practice it may be difficult to compute the full centralizer.

We will prove Theorem 5.1 by combining the last lemma with the following fundamental result [10, Theorem 9].

5.8. **Theorem.** *Let $G \leqslant \mathrm{S}_d$ be a transitive permutation group. Then there is a constant C (depending only on d) such that for each core point z, there is a non-zero invariant subspace $U \leqslant \mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$ over $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\|z|_U\|^2 \leqslant C$.*

In our situation, the W^α from Lemma 5.4 are the only irreducible subspaces, and thus for every core point z there is some $\alpha \in \Gamma_0$ with $\|z_\alpha\|^2 \leqslant C$.

We now prove the following more precise version of Theorem 5.1:

5.9. **Theorem.** *Let $G \leqslant \mathrm{S}_d$ be a QI-group. Then there is a constant M depending only on the group G such that for every core point z, there is a $c \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})}(G)$ and a vector $b \in \mathrm{Fix}(G) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$, such that $\|cz + b\|^2 \leqslant M$.*

Proof. Let z be a core point with $z \notin \mathrm{Fix}(G)$. By Lemma 5.7, there is $c \in C$ such that $\|cz_\alpha\|^2 \leqslant D\|cz_\beta\|^2$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$, where D is some constant depending only on G, not on z.

Since $y = cz$ is also a core point (Lemma 2.5), Theorem 5.8 yields that there is a $\beta \in \Gamma$ with $\|y_\beta\|^2 \leqslant C$. It follows that the squared norms of the other projections y_α are bounded by CD. Thus

$$\|y|_{\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp}\|^2 \leqslant C + (|\Gamma| - 1)CD$$

is bounded.

Since the projection to the fixed space can be bounded by translating with some $b \in \mathrm{Fix}(G) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$, the theorem follows. □

5.10. **Example.** Let p be a prime and let $G = C_p \leqslant \mathrm{S}_p$ be generated by a p-cycle. Then G is a QI-group. (Of course, every transitive group of prime degree is a QI-group.) For p odd, $\mathbb{R}^p$ decomposes into $\mathrm{Fix}(G)$ and $(p-1)/2$ irreducible subspaces

of dimension 2. Here the lattice can be identified with the group ring $\mathbb{Z}G$, and thus $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(p,\mathbb{Z})}(G) \cong \mathbf{U}(\mathbb{Z}G)$. The torsion free part of this unit group is a free abelian group of rank $(p-3)/2$.

Let us see what constant we can derive for $p = 5$. For concreteness, let $g = (1,2,3,4,5)$ and $G = \langle g \rangle$. We have the decomposition

$$\mathbb{R}^5 = \mathrm{Fix}(G) \oplus W \oplus W'.$$

The projections from $\mathbb{R}^5$ onto W and W' are given by

$$e_W = \frac{1}{5}(2 + ag + bg^2 + bg^3 + ag^4), \qquad a = \frac{-1+\sqrt{5}}{2},$$
$$e_{W'} = \frac{1}{5}(2 + bg + ag^2 + ag^3 + bg^4), \qquad b = \frac{-1-\sqrt{5}}{2}.$$

The centralizer of G has the form

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(5,\mathbb{Z})}(G) = \{\pm I\} \times G \times \langle u \rangle,$$

where u is a unit of infinite order. Here we can choose $u = -1 + g + g^4$ with inverse $-1 + g^2 + g^3$. To u corresponds the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{GL}(5,\mathbb{Z}). \tag{1}$$

This unit acts on W as $-1 + a$ and on W' as $-1 + b$. For the constant D of Lemma 5.7, we get $D = (b-1)^2 = 2 - 3b = (7 + 3\sqrt{5})/2$. For the constant C in Theorem 5.8, we get a bound $C = 48/5$ (from the proof). We can conclude that every core point is equivalent to one with squared norm smaller than $M = (2/5) + (48/5)(1 + 2 - 3b) \approx 50.6$.

We can get somewhat better bounds by applying Theorem 5.8 "layer-wise". The k-layer is, by definition, the set of all $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\sum z_i = k$. In our example, every lattice point is equivalent to one in layer 1 or layer 2.

For example, it can be shown that each core point in the 1-layer is equivalent to a point z with $\|z\|^2 \leqslant 31$. However, this bound is still far from optimal. Using the computer algebra system `GAP` [7], we found that the only core points of C_5 in the 1-layer up to normalizer equivalence are just

$$(1,0,0,0,0)^t, \qquad (1,1,0,0,-1)^t, \qquad (1,1,1,0,-2)^t,$$
$$(2,1,0,-1,-1)^t, \qquad (2,1,-2,0,0)^t.$$

(The normalizer $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(5,\mathbb{Z})}(G)$ is generated by the centralizer and the permutation matrix corresponding to the permutation $(2,3,5,4)$.) For completeness, we also

give a list of core points up to normalizer equivalence in the 2-layer:

$$(1,1,0,0,0)^t, \qquad (1,1,1,0,-1)^t, \qquad (2,1,0,0,-1)^t,$$
$$(2,1,1,-1,-1)^t, \qquad (2,1,1,-2,0)^t.$$

Every core point for C_5 is normalizer equivalent to exactly one of these ten core points.

For this example, an infinite series of core points of the form

$$(f_{j+1},0,f_j,f_j,0)^t,$$

where f_j is the j-th Fibonacci number, was found by Thomas Rehn [20, Section 5.2.2]. Each point in this series is equivalent to one of the two obvious core points $(1,0,0,0,0)^t$ and $(1,0,1,1,0)^t$. This follows from

$$(1-g-g^4)(f_{j+1},0,f_j,f_j,0)^t = (f_{j+1},-f_{j+2},0,0,-f_{j+2})^t$$

and thus

$$(1-g-g^4)(f_{j+1},0,f_j,f_j,0)^t + f_{j+2}(1,1,1,1,1)^t = (f_{j+3},0,f_{j+2},f_{j+2},0)^t.$$

5.11. **Example.** Now set

$$G = \langle (1,2,3,4,5),\ (1,4)(2,3)\rangle \cong D_5,$$

the dihedral group of order 10. Then

$$C_{\mathrm{GL}(5,\mathbb{Z})}(G) = \{\pm I\}\langle u\rangle,$$

where u is as in the previous example. The normalizer of G is the same as that of the cyclic group $C_5 = \langle (1,2,3,4,5)\rangle$. In particular, normalizer equivalence for D_5 and C_5 is the same equivalence relation. Of the core points from the last example, only $(1,0,0,0,0)^t$ and $(1,1,0,0,0)^t$ are also core points for D_5. (In fact, for most of the other points, we have some lattice point on an interval between two vertices, for example $(1,0,0,0,0)^t = (1/2)\Big((1,1,0,0,-1)^t + (2,5)(3,4)(1,1,0,0,-1)^t\Big)$. Thus there are only two core points up to normalizer equivalence in this example.

5.12. **Remark.** The number of core points up to normalizer equivalence seems to grow fast for cyclic groups of prime order. For $p = 7$, we get 515 core points up to normalizer equivalence.

Herr, Rehn and Schürmann [10] conjectured that a finite transitive permutation group G has infinitely many core points up to translation equivalence if the group is not 2-homogeneous. It is known that a permutation group $G \leqslant \mathrm{S}_d$ is 2-homogeneous if and only if $\mathrm{Fix}_{\mathbb{R}^d}(G)^\perp$ is irreducible [4, Lemma 2(iii)]. In this case, there are only finitely many core points up to translation equivalence [10, Corollary 10].

We propose the following conjecture, which is the converse of Theorem 5.1:

5.13. **Conjecture.** *Let $G \leqslant \mathrm{S}_d$ be a transitive permutation group such that $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$ contains a rational G-invariant subspace other than $\{0\}$ and $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$ itself. Then there are infinitely many core points up to normalizer equivalence.*

This can be seen as a generalization of the Herr-Rehn-Schürmann conjecture, since translation equivalence refines normalizer equivalence, and since whenever $\mathrm{Fix}(G)^\perp$ contains a nontrivial irrational G-invariant subspace, then there are infinitely many core points up to translation equivalence by Theorem 4.1 (or [10, Theorem 32]).

6. Application to Integer Linear Optimization

In this last section we describe a possible application of our theory to symmetric integer linear optimization problems. For many years it has been known that symmetry leads often to difficult problem instances in integer optimization. Standard approaches like branching usually work particularly poorly when large symmetry groups are present. Although in the past decade a few methods to use symmetry for certain special classes of problems have been suggested, we are still far from a good general strategy to deal with problem symmetries (see the surveys by Margot [17] and Pfetsch and Rehn [19] for an overview). The core point concept is a geometric approach that allows in principle to reduce a given symmetric problem to a subset of integer vectors – the core points of the problem [9].

A general standard form of an integer linear optimization problem is

$$\max c^t x \quad \text{such that} \quad Ax \leqslant b,\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{2}$$

for some given matrix A and vectors b and c, all of them usually rational. If $c = 0$, then we have a so-called *feasibility problem*, asking simply whether or not there is an integral solution to a given system of linear inequalities. Geometrically, we are asking whether some polyhedral set (usually a polytope) contains an integral point.

A group $G \leqslant \mathrm{GL}(d, \mathbb{Z})$ is called a *group of symmetries* of problem (2) if the constraints $Ax \leqslant b$ and the linear utility function $c^t x$ are invariant under the action of G on $\mathbb{R}^d$, that is, if $c^t(gx) = c^t x$ and $A(gx) \leqslant b$ for all $g \in G$ whenever $Ax \leqslant b$. The first condition is for instance satisfied if c is in the fixed space $\mathrm{Fix}(G)$. Practically, computing a group of symmetries for a given problem is usually reduced to the problem of finding symmetries of a suitable colored graph [3, 19]. Quite often in optimization, the attention is restricted to groups $G \leqslant \mathrm{S}_d$ acting on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by permuting coordinates.

Knowing the core points of a symmetry group G allows to restrict the search for optima of any G-invariant problem (2) to this subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ [9]. There are many possible ways how core points could be used. For instance, one could use the fact that core points are near invariant subspaces, by adding additional quadratic constraints (SDP-constraints). In the case of QI-groups, hence with finitely many core points up to normalizer equivalence, one could try to systematically run through core points x

satisfying the constraint $Ax \leqslant b$. Here we want to describe a different approach that opens the possibility of obtaining an equivalent, but easier reformulation of a G-invariant problem (2).

Generally, a linear reformulation of a problem as in (2) can be obtained by an integral linear substitution $x \mapsto Sx$ for some matrix $S \in \mathrm{GL}(d, \mathbb{Z})$:

$$\max(c^t S)x \quad \text{such that} \quad (AS)x \leqslant b,\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{3}$$

We remark that reformulations as in (3) with a matrix $S \in \mathrm{GL}(d, \mathbb{Z})$ can of course be applied to any linear integer optimization problem. In fact, this is a key idea of Lenstra's famous polynomial time algorithm in fixed dimension d [15]. In Lenstra's algorithm, the transformation matrix S is chosen to correspond to a suitable LLL-reduction of the lattice, such that the transformed polyhedral set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid (AS)x \leqslant b\}$ is sufficiently round. This idea has successfully been used for different problem classes of integer linear optimization problems (for an overview see [1]).

When we know that the optimization problem admits a group G as symmetry group, it seems natural to try to transform the problem with matrices S from the centralizer or normalizer of G. Note that when S is an element of the normalizer $\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})}(G)$, the problem (2) is G-invariant if and only if (3) is G-invariant. Note also that then $(c^t S)^t$ is in $\mathrm{Fix}(G)$.

We illustrate the idea with a small concrete problem instance of (2) which is invariant under the cyclic group C_5. In particular, we construct C_5-invariant integral optimization problems that are quite hard or even impossible to solve for state-of-the-art commercial solvers like `CPLEX` or `GUROBI`. For instance, this is often the case when the constraints $Ax \leqslant b$ can be satisfied by real vectors x, but not by integral ones.

6.1. **Example.** We use core points to construct infeasible integral optimization problems. The orbit polytope $P(C_5, z)$ of some integral point z has a description with linear inequalities of the form $x_1 + \ldots + x_5 = k$ and $Ax \leqslant b$, where A is a circulant 5×5-matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 \\ a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & a_1 \\ a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & a_1 & a_2 \\ a_4 & a_5 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ a_5 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

with integral entries $a_1, \ldots, a_5$, and $b \in \mathbb{Z}^5$ satisfies $b_1 = \ldots = b_5$. If z is a core point and if we replace b_i by $b'_i := b_i - 1$, then we get a system of inequalities having no integral solution.

Applying this construction to the core point

$$z = U^{10} \cdot (1, 1, 1, 0, -2)^t,$$

where U is the matrix from (1) in Example 5.10, we get parameters

$$a_1 = 515161, \quad a_2 = 18376, \quad a_3 = -503804,$$
$$a_4 = -329744, \quad a_5 = 300011, \quad b'_1 = 60.$$

We can vary the values of $k \equiv 1 \mod 5$ (geometrically, this corresponds to translating the polytope by some integral multiple of the all-one-vector). This gives a series of problem instances on which the commercial solvers very often not finish within a time limit of 10000 seconds on a usual desktop computer. For $k = 1$, which seems computationally the easiest case, a solution always still takes more than 4000 seconds.

However, knowing that a given problem as the above is C_5-invariant, we can try to find an easier reformulation (3) by using matrices from the centralizer. As a rule of thumb, we assume that a transformed problem with smaller coefficients is "easier". Here, the torsion free part of the centralizer is generated by the matrix U from (1) in Example 5.10, and so the only possibilities for S are U or U^{-1}. (A matrix of finite order will probably not simplify a problem significantly.) Here, applying $S = U$ yields an easier problem, and one quickly finds that after applying S ten times, the problem is not simplified further by applying U (or U^{-1}). In other words, we transform the original problem instance with U^{10}. This yields an equivalent C_5-invariant feasibility problem, which is basically instantly solved by the commercial solvers (finding that there is no integral solution).

As far as we know, this approach is in particular by far better than any previously known one that uses the symmetries of a cyclic group. One standard approach is for example to add symmetry-breaking inequalities $x_1 \leqslant x_2, \ldots, x_1 \leqslant x_5$. This yields an improved performance in some cases, but is far from the order of computational gain that is possible with our proposed reformulations.

For a general QI-group $G \leqslant \mathrm{S}_d$, we can try a similar approach. The idea is that for QI-groups, it should be possible with matrices from the centralizer to make the feasible region sufficiently round. (By Lemma 5.7, for any vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there is an element $S \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})}(G)$ such that the projections of Sx to the different G-invariant subspaces have approximately the same norm. This means that the orbit polytope of Sx is "round".)

Our approach is particularly straightforward when the torsion free part of the centralizer $\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{GL}(d,\mathbb{Z})}(G)$ has just rank 1, as in the example with $G = C_5$ above. When the centralizer contains a free abelian group of some larger rank, then it is less clear how to reduce the problem efficiently. A possible heuristics is as follows: Recall that in Lemma 5.5, we described a map L which maps the centralizer, and thus its torsion-free part of rank r (say), onto a certain lattice in $\mathbb{R}^{r+1}$. The idea is to choose some set of matrices from the centralizer that corresponds to a reduced basis of that lattice, or "small" combinations of such a basis. Then we just transform the problem

step by step with matrices from this finite set, until no further improvements are possible. For a thorough evaluation of this approach, further investigations are necessary.

References

1. Karen Aardal and Friedrich Eisenbrand. *Integer programming, lattices, and results in fixed dimension*. In: Discrete Optimization. Ed. by K. Aardal, G. L. Nemhauser, and R. Weismantel. Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science 12. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2005. Chap. 4, pp. 171–243. DOI: 10.1016/S0927-0507(05)12004-0. MR2265415 (cit. on p. 18).
2. Oliver Braun, Renaud Coulangeon, Gabriele Nebe, and Sebastian Schönnenbeck. *Computing in arithmetic groups with Voronoï's algorithm*. J. Algebra **435** (2015), 263–285. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2015.01.022. MR3343219 (cit. on p. 5).
3. David Bremner, Mathieu Dutour Sikirić, Dmitrii V. Pasechnik, Thomas Rehn, and Achill Schürmann. *Computing symmetry groups of polyhedra*. LMS J. Comput. Math. **17**, no. 1 (2014), 565–581. DOI: 10.1112/S1461157014000400. MR3356046 (cit. on p. 17).
4. Peter J. Cameron. *Bounding the rank of certain permutation groups*. Math. Z. **124**, no. 4 (1972), 343–352. DOI: 10.1007/BF01113925. MR0294471 (45 #3541) (cit. on p. 16).
5. John D. Dixon. *Permutation representations and rational irreducibility*. Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **71**, no. 3 (2005), 493–503. DOI: 10.1017/S0004972700038508. MR2150939 (2006c:20012) (cit. on pp. 9–11).
6. Paolo Faccin, Willem A. de Graaf, and Wilhelm Plesken. *Computing generators of the unit group of an integral abelian group ring*. J. Algebra **373** (2013), 441–452. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2012.09.031. MR2995037 (cit. on p. 6).
7. *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming*. Version 4.8.6. The GAP Group. 2016. URL: https://www.gap-system.org (visited on 2017-03-02) (cit. on p. 15).
8. Katrin Herr. *Core Sets and Symmetric Convex Optimization*. Dissertation. Technische Universität Darmstadt, 2013 (cit. on p. 4).
9. Katrin Herr, Thomas Rehn, and Achill Schürmann. *Exploiting symmetry in integer convex optimization using core points*. Oper. Res. Lett. **41**, no. 3 (2013), 298–304. DOI: 10.1016/j.orl.2013.02.007. MR3048847 (cit. on pp. 1, 3, 17).
10. Katrin Herr, Thomas Rehn, and Achill Schürmann. *On lattice-free orbit polytopes*. Discrete Comput. Geom. **53**, no. 1 (2015), 144–172. DOI: 10.1007/s00454-014-9638-x. MR3293492 (cit. on pp. 1–4, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17).
11. Klaus Hoechsmann. *Constructing units in commutative group rings*. Manuscripta Math. **75**, no. 1 (1992), 5–23. DOI: 10.1007/BF02567067. MR1156211 (cit. on p. 6).
12. I. Martin Isaacs. *Finite Group Theory*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics 92. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008. DOI: 10.1090/gsm/092. MR2426855 (2009e:20029) (cit. on p. 5).

13. Ernst Kleinert. *Units of classical orders: a survey*. Enseign. Math. (2) **40**, no. 3-4 (1994), 205–248. DOI: 10.5169/seals-61112. MR1309127 (95k:11151) (cit. on pp. 5, 6, 8).
14. Tsit-Yuen Lam. *A First Course in Noncommutative Rings*. 2nd ed. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 131. Springer, New York et al., 2001. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-8616-0. MR1838439 (2002c:16001) (cit. on pp. 7, 9).
15. H. W. Lenstra Jr. *Integer programming with a fixed number of variables*. Math. Oper. Res. **8**, no. 4 (1983), 538–548. DOI: 10.1287/moor.8.4.538. MR727410 (cit. on p. 18).
16. Zbigniew Marciniak and Sudarshan K. Sehgal. *Generic units in abelian group rings*. J. Group Theory **8**, no. 6 (2005), 777–799. DOI: 10.1515/jgth.2005.8.6.777. MR2179670 (cit. on p. 6).
17. François Margot. *Symmetry in integer linear programming*. In: 50 Years of Integer Programming 1958-2008. From the early years to the state-of-the-art. Ed. by Michael Jünger, Thomas Liebling, Denis Naddef, et al. Springer, Berlin, 2010. Chap. 17, pp. 647–686. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-68279-0_17. MR2640549. Zbl: 1187.90200 (cit. on p. 17).
18. Jürgen Neukirch. *Algebraische Zahlentheorie*. Reprint of the 1992 original. Springer, Berlin et al., 2007. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-37663-7. Zbl: 1131.11002. English translation available (Springer 1999) (cit. on p. 12).
19. Marc Pfetsch and Thomas Rehn. *A computational comparison of symmetry handling methods for mixed integer programs*. Preprint. 2015. URL: http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2015/11/5209.html (visited on 2017-02-24) (cit. on p. 17).
20. Thomas Rehn. *Exploring Core Points for Fun and Profit. A Study of Lattice-Free Orbit Polytopes*. Dissertation. Universität Rostock, 2013. urn:nbn:de:gbv:28-diss2014-0082-2 (cit. on pp. 2, 4, 7, 16).
21. Irving Reiner. *Maximal Orders*. L.M.S. Monographs 5. Academic Press, London et al., 1975. MR0393100 (52 #13910) (cit. on pp. 5, 6).
22. Jean-Pierre Serre. *Linear Representations of Finite Groups*. Trans. from the French by Leonard Scott. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 42. Springer, New York et al., 1977. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4684-9458-7. MR0450380 (56 #8675) (cit. on p. 10).

Universität Rostock, Institut für Mathematik, Ulmenstr. 69, Haus 3, 18057 Rostock, Germany

E-mail address: frieder.ladisch@uni-rostock.de

E-mail address: achill.schuermann@uni-rostock.de